

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 9, 11-12, 14-15, 17-18, 32, 34-39, and 41-46 are now pending in the application, with claims 9, 32, and 41 being independent. Applicant cancels claims 10, 13, 16, and 33 without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer of the subject matter. Applicant amends claims 9, 17, 32, and 41 to further clarify features of the claimed subject matter. Applicant adds claims 43-46 to further clarify features of the claimed subject matter. The original specification and drawings support these claim amendments and additions at least at paragraphs 0024, 0027, 0028, 0029, 0030, 0036, 0049, 0090, 0092, 0093, and Figs. 1 and 11. Thus, these revisions introduce no new matter.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 10, 13, 16, and 17, are rejected und 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant cancels **claims 10, 13, and 16** without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer of the subject matter. Accordingly, the rejection is now moot.

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends claim 17 as discussed during the interview to recite:

A method as recited in claim 9, wherein *after the silently signing in*, the user has access to a notification selected from a group comprising a friend request and a cross-title game invitation to switch from an offline game to an online game, wherein the offline game is played by players with access to the dedicated game

console and wherein the online game allows the players to play the online game against one or more other players online.

The Office asserts that “It is not clear how a user receives a notification if they [sic] are playing an off-line game. Applicant’s specification discloses that messages can be received only by online games” (Office Action, page 3). A portion of the actual disclosure of Applicant’s specification is presented below.

The following disclosure describes the *silent sign-in* for offline game titles. The signing-in (also referred to as logging-in herein) *affords the user access to* select online services such as an in-game notification, *a cross-title game invitation*, a friend request (e.g., inviting a user to become a friend), and/or data corresponding to a friends list which are traditionally only available to online titles with a signed-in user. Such access *enables a gamer to readily switch from an offline game to an online game* when the situation changes (e.g., a friend signs-in or issues an invitation to play an online game). Silently signing in generally indicates that a user of a console is automatically signed onto an online service without requiring action by a user of a console in an implementation.

(Applicant’s disclosure, paragraph 0020; emphasis added)

Accordingly, it is clear from Applicant’s disclosure that the problem of traditional gaming systems—only providing access to online services when the user is playing an online game—is addressed by Applicant’s teaching of silent sign-in for offline game titles.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §112 rejection.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 9, 13, 16, 32-33, and 37-39 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by AOL Instant Messenger (cited from <http://www.aol.com.au/site/websitelaolproducts/aim/help.php> March 11, 2001 version) (hereinafter “Aim 3/11/01”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends **independent claim 9**, to clarify further features of the subject matter. Amended claim 9 now recites a method comprising computer instructions, which when executed by a processor of a dedicated game console, instruct the dedicated game console to perform acts comprising:

determining if at least one user account is present on a dedicated game console;

if the at least one user account is present, determining if automatic sign-in is enabled on the dedicated game console; and

if automatic sign-in is enabled, silently signing in a most recently signed in user account onto an online service without requiring action by a user, *wherein the silently signing in comprises:*

opening a secure communication channel between the dedicated game console and a security gateway based on a security ticket obtained from a key distribution center;

establishing a security key configured to encrypt data transferred between the dedicated game console and the security gateway;

transmitting encrypted data packets between the dedicated game console and a secure data center, the data center accessible via the security gateway;

registering a presence of the specific user account by a presence server inside the secure data center; and

responsive to registering the presence of the specific user account, providing a user of the dedicated gaming console with access and online service available from the secure data center.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such method is disclosed by AIM 3/11/01.

The MPEP indicates that in order for a single reference to support a *prima facie* case of anticipation of an applicant's claim, the examiner must first interpret the claim, and thereafter show that the cited reference discloses the same elements, in the same arrangement, as the elements of the applicant's claim (MPEP §2131). More specifically, the MPEP states that "[a] claim is anticipated *only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found*, either

expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. . . . The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim. . . . The elements must be arranged as required by the claim” MPEP §2131 (emphasis added). Consequently, under the guidelines of the MPEP set forth above, if there is *any* substantial difference between the single reference used to support anticipation and an applicant’s claim, then the reference is NOT able to support a *prima facie* case of anticipation.

AIM 3/11/01 Fails to Disclose Silently Signing In

AIM 3/11/01 is directed towards answering frequently asked questions from users about AOL Instant Messenger (page 1). AIM 3/11/01 discusses the difference between “Save Password” and “Auto-login” (page 2). “With ‘Save Password’ and ‘Auto-login’ both selected, you will automatically be signed on to AOL instant Messenger whenever you double-click on the AOL Instant Messenger icon on your desktop” (page 2).

AIM 3/11/01 does not disclose silently signing in comprising “*opening a secure communication channel between the dedicated game console and a security gateway based on a security ticket obtained from a key distribution center; establishing a security key configured to encrypt data transferred between the dedicated game console and the security gateway; transmitting encrypted data packets between the dedicated game console and a secure data center, the data center accessible via the security gateway; registering a presence of the specific user account by a presence server inside the secure data center; and responsive to registering the presence of the specific user account, providing a user of the dedicated gaming console with access and online service available from the secure data center,*” as recited in Applicant’s amended claim 9.

For at least this reason, AIM 3/11/01 fails to disclose each and every element of Applicant's amended claim 9.

Applicant cancels **dependent claims 13 and 16** without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer of the subject matter and elements of claims 13 and 16 are now recited in independent claim 9. Accordingly, the rejections are now moot.

Independent claim 32 is directed to a computer-readable media and is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 9.

Independent claim 32 recites one or more computer-readable media having instructions stored thereon that, when executed, direct a machine to perform acts comprising:

determining if at least one user account is present on a gaming device;

if the at least one user account is present, determining if automatic sign-in is enabled; and

if automatic sign-in is enabled, signing in a most recently signed in user account onto an online service, *wherein the signing in comprises:*

opening a secure communication channel between the gaming device and a security gateway based on a security ticket obtained from a key distribution center;

establishing a security key configured to encrypt data transferred between the gaming device and the security gateway;

transmitting encrypted data packets between the gaming device and a secure data center, the data center accessible via the security gateway;

registering a presence of the specific user account by a presence server inside the secure data center; and

responsive to registering the presence of the specific user account, providing a user of the gaming device with access to an online service available from the secure data center.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such computer-readable media is disclosed by AIM 3/11/01.

Applicant cancels **dependent claim 33** without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer of the subject matter and elements of claim 33 are now recited in independent claim 32. Accordingly, the rejection is now moot.

Dependent claims 37-39 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 32, and thus, are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in claim 32, are not disclosed by AIM 3/11/01. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of each dependent claim.

Accordingly, for all of the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that as each and every feature is not disclosed, the claims are not anticipated by AIM 3/11/01. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §102(b) rejections.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 A., B., and C.

A. **Claims 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over AIM 3/11/01 as applied to claim 32 above, and further in view of AOL Instant Messenger (cited from http://www.aim.com/help_faq/linux/latest_linux.adp Feb 02, 2002 version), (hereinafter “AIM 2/2/02”).** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As explained above, AIM 3/11/01 does not disclose the recited features of independent claim 32. **Dependent claims 34-36** depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 32, and thus, are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Applicant has searched and failed to find any disclosure, teaching, or suggestion in AIM 2/2/02 that compensates for the deficiencies in AIM 3/11/01. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in claim 32, are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by AIM 3/11/01 and AIM 2/2/02, alone or in combination.

B. Claims 10-12, 14-15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Easley et al. (US 2002/0142842) in view of AIM 3/11/01 in view of AIM 2/2/02 in view of AOL Instant Messenger (cited from http://www.AOL.COM.AU/site/website/aolprdruts/aim/new_features.php Aug. 18, 2001 version), (hereinafter "AIM' 8/18/01"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant cancels **dependent claim 10** without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer of the subject matter and elements of claim 10 are now recited in independent claim 9. Accordingly, the rejection is now moot.

As explained above, AIM 3/11/01 does not disclose the recited features of independent claim 9. **Dependent claims 11-12, 14-15, and 17** depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 9, and thus, are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Applicant has searched and failed to find any disclosure, teaching, or suggestion in Easley, AIM 2/2/02 and/or AIM 8/18/01 that compensates for the deficiencies in AIM 3/11/01. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in claim and 9, are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by Easley, AIM 3/11/01, AIM 2/2/02, and/or AIM 8/18/01, alone or in combination.

C. Claims 18, 41, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AIM 3/11/01, in view of Nishiumi (US 6,001,015). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As explained above, AIM 3/11/01 does not disclose the recited features of independent claim 9. **Dependent claim 18** depends is from independent claim 9, and thus, is allowable as

depending from an allowable base claim. Applicant has searched and failed to find any disclosure, teaching, or suggestion in Nishiumi that compensates for the deficiencies in AIM 3/11/01. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features that, in combination with those recited in claim 9, are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by AIM 3/11/01 and/or Nishiumi, alone or in combination.

Independent claim 41 is directed to a method and is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 9.

Independent claim 41 recites a method comprising computer instructions, which when executed by a processor of a dedicated game console, instruct the dedicated game console to perform acts comprising:

coupling a controller to a one of a plurality of controller support subassemblies of a dedicated game console, wherein *the dedicated game console comprises:*

a video processing pipeline for graphics processing, the video processing pipeline comprising a three-dimensional graphics processing unit, a video encoder, and a digital video bus configured to carry data from the three-dimensional graphics processing unit to the video encoder; and

the plurality of controller support subassemblies, each controller support subassembly supporting a plurality of controllers;

determining if a memory unit of the controller corresponds to a specific user account; and

when the member unit of the controller corresponds to the specific user account, silently signing in the specific user account onto an online service, wherein the silently signing in comprises:

opening a secure communication channel between the dedicated game console and a security gateway based on a security ticket obtained from a key distribution center;

establishing a security key configured to encrypt data transferred between the dedicated game console and the security gateway;

*transmitting encrypted data packets between the dedicated game console and a secure data center, the data center accessible via the security gateway;
registering a presence of the specific user account by a presence server inside the secure data center; and
responsive to registering the presence of the specific user account, providing a user of the dedicated gaming console with access to an online service available from the secure data center.*

Applicant respectfully submits that no such method is disclosed, taught, or suggested by AIM 3/11/01 and/or Nishiumi.

Applicant has searched and failed to find any disclosure, teaching, or suggestion in Nishiumi that compensates for the deficiencies in AIM 3/11/01 as discussed with respect to independent claim 9.

Applicant has also searched and failed to find any disclosure, teaching, or suggestion in AIM 3/11/01 and/or Nishiumi of "*a video processing pipeline for graphics processing, **the video processing pipeline comprising a three-dimensional graphics processing unit, a video encoder, and a digital video bus configured to carry data from the three-dimensional graphics processing unit to the video encoder,***" as recited in Applicant's amended claim 41.

Dependent claim 42 depends is from independent claim 41, and thus, is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features that, in combination with those recited in claim 41, are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by AIM 3/11/01 and/or Nishiumi, alone or in combination.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not render the claimed subject matter obvious and that the claimed subject matter, therefore, patentably distinguishes over the cited references. For all of these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §103(a) rejections.

New Claims 43-46

Applicant adds claims 43-46 to further clarify the subject matter. Claims 43 and 44 depend from independent claim 9 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. Claims 45 and 46 depend indirectly from independent claim 32 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Furthermore, Applicant has searched and failed to find evidence in the references of record of “*wherein after the signing in, the user has access to a friends list comprising a name of friends, an online or offline status of each one of the friends, a game each one of the friends is playing, and a voice-enabled status of each one of the friends,*” as recited in Applicant’s new claims 43 and 46.

Applicant respectfully requests favorable consideration and allowance of new claims 43-46.

Conclusion

Claims 9, 11-12, 14-15, 17-18, 32, 34-39, and 41-46 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the subject application. **If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.**

Respectfully Submitted,
Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Dated: December 23, 2008

By: /Benjamin Keim/
Benjamin A. Keim
Reg. No. 59,217
509.944.4748

Shirley Lee Anderson
Reg. No. 57,763
509.944.4758